

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the nonfinal Office Action of October 26, 2005.

Reconsideration and allowance of the application and all presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Upon entry of this Response, claims 1, 5-8, 10, and 11 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 5-8, 10, and 11 have been amended. Claims 2-4, 9, and 12-30 are canceled. The prior art made of record has been considered, but is not believed to affect the patentability of the presently pending claims. Applicants believe that no new matter has been added by the amendments and that a new search is not necessary.

CLAIMS

Claim Rejections

Claims 10 and 11

Claims 10 and 11 have been amended to overcome their respective rejections, and therefore the rejections should be withdrawn.

Claim 1

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as purportedly being anticipated independently by Jacobine et al. (U.S. Patent 5,167,882). Claim 1 is also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as purportedly being anticipated by Moszner et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0167100) and Thies et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0142274). Amended claim 1 reads as follows:

1. A method of producing a three-dimensional object, comprising the steps of:
 - providing a norbornene based curable material including at least one initiator and at least one norbornene based build material, wherein the norbornene based curable material is a multi-part norbornene based curable material;
 - dispensing the norbornene based curable material onto a build platform, *wherein the at least one initiator and the at least one norbornene based build material are dispensed onto the build platform independently, wherein the initiator is dispensed from a first ink-jet printhead and the norbornene based build material is dispensed from a second ink-jet printhead, wherein the at least one initiator and the at least one norbornene based build material are commingled to form the multi-part norbornene based curable material;* and
 - curing the norbornene based curable material to produce the three-dimensional object.

(Emphasis added). Applicants traverse each of the §102 rejections in the Office Action and submit that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b and e) in view of each Jacobine, Moszner, and Thies, should be withdrawn because none of the references, individually or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests each and every feature of claim 1 above. In this regard, Jacobine, Moszner, and Thies do not, individually or in combination, disclose, teach, or suggest *dispensing the initiator and the norbornene based build material independently from one another*. In addition, Jacobine, Moszner, and Thies do not, individually or in combination, disclose, teach, or suggest *dispensing the initiator and the norbornene based build material from different ink-jet printheads*. If the current rejections are maintained, Applicants request

that future Office Actions specifically list for each reference where each feature of claim 1 is mentioned. Thus, Jacobine, Moszner, and Thies do not, individually or in combination, disclose, teach, or suggest, at least the limitations highlighted above in claim 1, and therefore, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Applicants also traverse the assertion that stereolithography and inkjet processing are equivalent. Stereolithography and inkjet processing operate very differently. For example, in a stereolithographic process, a structure is built upon a platform situated just below the surface in a vat of liquid polymer. A laser traces out the first layer, solidifying the structure's cross section while leaving excess areas as liquid polymer. Next, an elevator incrementally lowers the platform into the liquid polymer. A sweeper re-coats the solidified layer with liquid polymer, and the laser traces the second layer atop the first. This process is repeated until the structure is complete. Afterwards, the structure is removed from the vat and rinsed clean of excess liquid. In contrast, the inkjet process described on page 3, lines 25-33 and page 4, lines 1-5 are very different from stereolithographic processes.


Claims 5-8, 10, and 11

Applicants traverse each of the §102 rejections in the Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that pending dependent claims 5-8, 10, and 11 include every feature of independent claim 1 and that Jacobine, Moszner, and Thies each fail to disclose, teach, or suggest, individually or in combination, at least the features of claim 1 highlighted hereinabove. Thus, pending dependent claims 5-8, 10, and 11 are also allowable over the prior art of record. In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request that this application and all presently pending claims be allowed to issue. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding Applicant's response, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicant's undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'CBL', is written over a horizontal line.

Christopher B. Linder, Reg. No. 47,751

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500



CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that the below listed items are being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

**Mail Stop Missing Parts
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450**

on 1/25/06

Sara Rogers
Sara A. Rogers

In Re Application of:

Oliver, et al.

Serial No.: 10/642,971

Filed: August 18, 2003

Confirmation No.: 3388

Group Art Unit: 1732

Examiner: Leo B. Tentoni

Docket No. HP: 200309784-1
TKHR: 050834-1050

For: **SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR USING NORBORNENE BASED CURABLE MATERIALS**

The following is a list of documents enclosed:

Return Postcard
Amendment
Amendment Transmittal Sheet